3104. d 15
2

DR. GEDDES'S

GENERAL ANSWER

TO THE

QUERIES, COUNSILS, AND CRITICISMS

THAT HAVE BEEN COMMUNICATED TO HIM SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF HIS PROPOSALS FOR PRINTING

A NEW TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE.

Tantis ſtudiorum obruor laboribus, et innumerabilium epiſtolis ſic undique provocor, ut ſingulis reſpondere non queam.

ERASM. EP. C. VELIO.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY J. DAVIS,

AND SOLD BY R. FAULDER, BOND-STREET; AND J. JOHNSON ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

MDCCXC.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO THE READER.

HAVING received, ſince the publication of my PROPOSALS and SPECIMENS, a great number of letters relative to my work; and not having leiſure to make particular and reſpective acknowledgments, I have judged it expedient to publiſh the following ſheets as a *General Anſwer* to them all. I have ordered it to be printed in the ſame form with my *Proſpectus*, and *Letter to the Biſhop of London*, that the three tracts may be conveniently bound up together; but in a ſmaller character, that the price may be as low as poſſible.

ERRATA.

Page 5, ſecond note, for *Tret.* read *Fret.*
—— 12, line 27, for ἱερος read ἑρευς.

GENERAL ANSWER, &c.

WHEN, with my PROPOSALS, I publiſhed *Specimens* of my *New Tranſlation* of the *Bible*, I was perfectly aware, how much I expoſed myſelf to the ſhafts of criticiſm. Yet I thought it but fair to run the riſk, and honeſtly to lay before the public a ſample of what they might expect for their money: eſpecially as the price was high, and the vender an obſcure adventurer in the commerce of letters.

For whatever may be my abilities as a writer, I hope never to forfeit the character of an honeſt man: and I would rather have a hundred ſubſcribers by openneſs and candour, than a hundred thouſand through guile and artifice. For I cannot think with Sophocles's Oreſtes, "that nothing gainful is evil *." Hence I have taken no pains to ſolicit names, uſed no ſiniſter means to procure eulogiums, nor employed the pen of a ſingle friend to puff away my ware. Such as it is, I have bluntly diſplayed it; and ſaid, "Gentlemen, buy, if ye pleaſe!"—*Legant, qui volunt, qui nolunt, abjiciant* †.

Nor do I yet repent of having ſo acted.—That praiſe is ever the moſt flattering, which has not been ſurpriſed.—The manner in which my ſpecimens have been generally received by the learned, both at home and abroad, would excite a degree of confidence in timidity itſelf; and the reſpectable liſt of unmendicated ſubſcriptions, already come to hand, encourages me to proſecute my plan with new ardour:—for greater aſſiduity I can hardly beſtow.

Indeed, if aſſiduity and ardour were ever needful for the proſecution of an enterpriſe, they are certainly ſo for the proſecution of mine. He, who undertakes a New Tranſlation of the SACRED SCRIPTURES, lies under diſadvantages, in any country, which no other tranſlator has to encounter: and there are circumſtances which make them lie peculiarly heavy on an Engliſh tranſlator. The idea that has for almoſt two centuries pre-

* Δοκω μεν ουδεν ρημα, συν κερδει, κακον. Elect. 61.

† Hieron. Ep. ad Domin. & Rogat.

vailed,

vailed, of the ſuper-excellence of our *Public Verſion*, is alone an almoſt inſuperable difficulty. Mankind are naturally unwilling to ſee, and aſhamed to acknowledge, not only their own faults, but even the faults of thoſe whom, from their earlieſt years, they have been taught to admire and revere. JAMES's tranſlators have been ſo long in poſſeſſion of ſo high a reputation, and their work has been conſidered as ſuch a pattern of perfection, that the ſmalleſt deviation from their ſtandard, is, by many, deemed a ſpecies of literary felony, which admits not *benefit of clergy*.

Had *Herodotus* or *Livy* been my original, it would have been enough for me to vie with *Littlebury* or *Hayes*: and as few or none could, at this day, be ſuppoſed to have any particular predilection to either of thoſe writers, my verſion would have a fair chance of being read without prejudice or partiality; and its merit chiefly appretiated by comparing it with the original. Of this there are not many capable; conſequently, the number of my judges would be ſmall.—But, in my preſent caſe, I have as many judges as there are readers of the Old Tranſlation; and every one of theſe thinks himſelf, more or leſs, a competent judge.

It is, however, hardly poſſible, that his judgment can be entirely unbiaſſed. His ears, his eyes, his lips, are ſo intimately familiarized to the very ſounds, images, and articulations of the Vulgar Verſion, that any other mode of rendering muſt at firſt appear to him intolerable. To expect from ſuch ears a patient hearing, from ſuch eyes a fair reviſal, from ſuch lips an impartial doom, would be a vain expectation.—Therefore, having ventured to adopt a mode of tranſlating ſomewhat different from that of the *Vulgar Verſion*, I laid my account with all the objections that have been made, or will be made to it: and, in truth, I expected to meet with a much greater number of cenſurers than have yet appeared.

Cenſures, nevertheleſs, have been made; *Counſils* have been given, and *Queſtions* have been aſked: to all which I mean to give plain and candid anſwers in the following pages.—I ſhall begin with my Queriſts.

QUERIES.

I. *Theodoret* aſks, why I did not purſue the method recommended by Bp. Lowth in his preface to Iſaiah, and ſo ſucceſsfully, ſince, purſued by Dr. Blayney and Bp. Newcome; and rather attempt to improve the *Old Verſion*, than to make a *New* one?—My anſwer ſhall be fair and explicit: "Becauſe I did not like that method."—If it ſtill be aſked, why I did not like it, I will try to account for that alſo.

When, almoſt 30 years ago, I formed a deſign of tranſlating the BIBLE, I was acquainted with only two verſions of it; the *Vulgar Latin*, and the Vulgar *Engliſh*. The latter had been familiar to me from my infancy: for, although my parents were Roman Catholics, they were not bigots; and the Bible was the principal book in their ſcanty library. They taught me to read it with reverence and attention; and before I had

reached my eleventh year, I knew all its hiſtory by heart. My firſt prejudices, then, were in favour of the Vulgar Engliſh Verſion.

When I had acquired a ſufficient knowledge of Latin, the *Vulgate* was put into my hands; which I was afterwards obliged to ſtudy more minutely, as being the text-book of our ſchools and colleges. And now it was that I perceived a conſiderable difference between it and the Engliſh tranſlation. The latter appeared to me rugged, conſtrained, and often obſcure, where the former was ſmooth, eaſy, and intelligible. The one ſeemed to read like a *tranſlation*, the other like an *original*.—Such, at that time, was my opinion: and I confeſs that whatever I have ſince read has ſerved only to confirm me in it. Let this be called prejudice; I have no objection: but certainly it has not been ſlightly formed, nor blindly followed.

When in 1762 I began to read the originals, I had both verſions conſtantly before me; and now I diſcovered the cauſe of the great difference between them. The chief ſtudy of the Engliſh tranſlators, I found, had been to give a ſtrictly literal verſion, at the expence of almoſt every other conſideration: while the author of the Vulgate had endeavoured to render his originals, equivalently, into ſuch Latin as was current in his age. —"If ever I tranſlate the Bible," ſaid I then, "it muſt be after this manner."

In fact, my *idea* of a New Tranſlation was ſoon after hatched; and although the original plan has been often retouched, it has undergone but few material alterations.

On leaving the univerſity, I was fortunately placed in a nobleman's family, where I had plenty of time and a tolerable library, to enable me to continue my favourite ſtudy. The ancient verſions in the Polyglott were now alternately read and occaſionally compared: and from this lecture and compariſon I was every day more and more ſatisfied, that a verbal verſion of the Bible is not the moſt proper to convey its meaning and diſplay its beauties. I obſerved, that even thoſe tranſlators, who had the text to render, not into a different language, but only into different dialects of the ſame language, had not attempted a ſtrictly literal verſion: and that thoſe of them, who were the leaſt literal, had the moſt forcibly and intelligibly rendered their text.

But when from the *ancient* I turned to the *modern* verſions, my opinion was ſoon ſtrengthened into conviction. There were ſeven modern verſions to which I had then acceſs—The *French* of Geneva, the *Italian* of *Bruccioli*, the *Dutch* national; and, in Latin, thoſe of *Munſter*, *Caſtalio*, *Junius*, and *Pagninus*. Of all theſe I have given a ſhort account in my *Proſpectus*: and ſhall here only ſay,—That the one of the ſeven which I opened with prejudice, was the one of the ſeven which I read through with the greateſt pleaſure.

I had been taught to conſider Caſtalio's Tranſlation as a profane burleſque of Holy Writ. What was my ſurpriſe to find, that he had ſeized the very ſpirit of the original, and transfuſed it into elegant Latin! I ſaw indeed, and was ſorry to ſee, that, through his exceſſive refinement, a part of the ſimplicity of his original had evaporated in the ope-

ration: and in this reſpect his verſion is inferior to the Vulgate: but ſtill the ſpirit of the original is there; whereas that of his contraſt Pagninus appears like an almoſt breathleſs body, dragging along its limbs in the moſt awkward and clumſy manner. Yet this ſame Pagninus has been the general model of vernacular verſions.

At this period, a long and cruel interruption was put to my biblical ſtudies: and I had but little hopes of ever being in a ſituation to reſume them; when Providence threw me into the arms of ſuch a PATRON, as Origen himſelf might have been proud to boaſt of—A PATRON, who, for theſe ten years paſt, has, with a dignity peculiar to himſelf, afforded me every conveniency that my heart could deſire towards the carrying on and completing of my arduous work.

Hitherto I had been only levelling the ground, and collecting materials. Theſe were now to be arranged, reviſed, and augmented for the purpoſe of raiſing the edifice: the plan of which I muſt at length decidedly fix upon.—Again I reviewed, in order, all the verſions I could procure, from the Septuagint down to Houbigant—Still the Latin Vulgate appeared to be the beſt model.

However, not to proceed with precipitation, I re-examined our own Vulgar Engliſh Verſion with a very ſtrict attention, and traced the hiſtory of its pretended improvements through every ſtage back to Tindal. The reſult of my reſearch was very different indeed from that of a late Reviewer *.—I will venture, on the contrary, to affirm (and I affirm with full conviction), that James's tranſlators have leſs merit, than any of their predeceſſors; and that the verſion of Tindal, reviſed by Coverdale, is a juſter repreſentation of the original (ſuch as he had it) than our preſent Vulgar Verſion.—The truth is—and why ſhould not the truth be ſpoken? ορθον γαρ η αληθεια εστι—that James's tranſlators did little more than copy the Geneva Verſion †; which was little more than a tranſcript from the reviſed French; which was chiefly borrowed from Pagninus. If any one doubt of this, let him compare all thoſe verſions with as much pains and patience as I have done; and then let him contradict me.—*Legant prius, et poſtea deſpiciant* ‡.

If I had been inclined to make any prior Engliſh verſion the ground-work of mine, it would certainly have been Tindal's.—And this is, perhaps, what I would have done, if Tindal's Hebrew text and mine had been exactly the ſame. His mode of tranſlating is ſo little different from mine, that it would have been an eaſy taſk to mould it into the

* We muſt be permitted ſeriouſly to doubt, whether the united learning and taſte of the preſent race of Oriental Scholars in this country, with all their boaſted advantages, would be able to produce, *de novo*, a verſion of the Bible which ſhould be equal in its general effect to that which we now poſſeſs. Monthly Rev. for Jan. 1790, p. 66.

† The principal difference conſiſts in a more ſcrupulous adheſion to the letter of the original, and in the inſertion of a multitude of italics to ſupply its apparent deficiency; although the greater part of theſe ſupplements are virtually contained in the Hebrew. On the whole, I make no heſitation to declare, that I think the Geneva Verſion, in general, the better of the two.

‡ Hieron. Ep. ad Paul. & Euſtoch.

ſame ſhape. But this would not have anſwered my purpoſe. As I had been long fully convinced of the imperfection and mutilation of the preſent Maſoretic copies of the Hebrew Scriptures, my firſt care had been to reſtore them as nearly as poſſible to their original integrity, by every mean that authority or criticiſm preſented. It was this corrected text which I had to tranſlate; and which, that I might be the leſs influenced by ſyſtem or precedent, I was reſolved to conſider as never having been tranſlated before; without any regard to its preſent punctuation or diviſion. The words and ſentences of this corrected, unpointed, and undivided text, I then endeavoured to render into equivalent Engliſh terms; terms, ſuch as the authors themſelves would, in my fancy, have moſt probably uſed, if they had written in the language of the tranſlator.—And this, to me, appears to be the only juſt mode of tranſlating: whereas, to render the peculiar idiotiſms of any language into any other language, is not to *tranſlate*, but to *traveſty*, as Dr. Campbell well expreſſes it.—For this reaſon I have rarely tranſlated ſuch idiotiſms as our language doth not eaſily receive, even in the notes; except when I was uncertain of the meaning, or for the purpoſe of illuſtrating ſome Jewiſh rite or uſage.

The authority and example of Bp Newcome have been repeatedly urged to me, againſt this mode of tranſlating: but (let me ſay it with all due deference to that moſt learned and reſpectable prelate) it was that very example which he has ſet in his improved verſion of the Minor Prophets, that ultimately and unalterably confirmed me in my former opinion; namely, that a verbal verſion of the Hebrew Scriptures is the way not to explain but to obſcure them: and I am perſuaded, that if Bp. Newcome had followed a different method, and weighed the meaning of his author more than the words, we ſhould read his tranſlation with double pleaſure.

With reſpect to Bp. Lowth (whoſe memory will ever be moſt dear to me), I can aſſure the reader, that he was ſo well pleaſed with my arguments in favour of a *ſentential*, not a *literal*, tranſlation, that he ſeriouſly adviſed me to purſue that plan; and earneſtly wiſhed (good man!) to live to ſee it completed—*Sed aliter viſum ſuperis.*

I ſhall here repeat, then, what I have quoted from De Valentia in another place *: "Ea tranſlatio vera eſt, cujus ſenſus a ſuo fonte non deviat, ſed ſententias reddit et eaſdem "et æquales."—To which let me add the opinion of a ſtill better judge: "Non debemus "ſic verbum de verbo exprimere, ut dum ſyllabas ſequimur, perdamus intelligentiam †."

II. A Reverend Gentleman, and one of my ſubſcribers, wiſhes to know—1ſt. If my ſubſcription be nearly filled up?—2dly, What encouragement I have met with from the Eſtabliſhed Church, from the Proteſtant Diſſenters, and from thoſe of my own Communion?

To the firſt of theſe queries, I muſt anſwer in the negative. My ſubſcribers do not

* Proſpectus, p. 127.

† Hieron. Epiſt. ad Sunn. et Tret.—See afterwards more on this ſubject, in my anſwer to Criticiſms.

yet

yet amount to one half of a thouſand; as he will ſee by the liſt of them at the end of this pamphlet.

The ſame liſt will in ſome meaſure ſerve to anſwer his ſecond query, if he be much acquainted with the world; as the names ſpeak for themſelves. But as truth ought never to be aſhamed, I will tell the truth. From the two firſt denominations I have received more, from the laſt leſs, encouragement than I had reaſon to expect.—Our Saviour ſays, "A prophet is no where unhonoured but in his own country." It may in like manner happen that an interpreter be no where leſs honoured than in his own communion. While the Jews gave a favourable teſtimony to the merit of Jerome's verſion, his Chriſtian brethren (whom he calls his *dogs*) were tearing it in pieces.—See the next query.

III. A *Roman Catholic* aſks, whether my Verſion has been approved by Bp. Talbot? in which caſe he would willingly be a ſubſcriber!

I anſwer—I never ſought the approbation of Biſhop Talbot, or of any other biſhop whomſoever. A biſhop's, or even a pope's approbation can give no intrinſic value to any work; and a work that has intrinſic value, needs not their approbation. Whether mine be ſuch or not, it is for the learned public to determine: and if their determination be favourable, not the ſentence of a whole ſynod of biſhops can reverſe it. In any event, I will never walk in trammels, if I can avoid it; and leaſt of all in mental trammels.—If *Roman* Catholics are to read no books but ſuch as are formally approved by a biſhop, their libraries will not be very numerous, nor very coſtly.—My queriſt, however, is not, I find, the only R. Catholic who is in the ſame diſagreeable ſuſpenſe: I muſt leave it to time to relieve them.—Mean while, I cannot help ſaying with a much greater man, *Quid autem ingratius quam pro tam immenſis ſudoribus vigiliiſque, quas tantum juvandi animo ſuſceperis, et quibus nulla par gratia referri queat, rependi calumniam; idque potiſſimum ab iis, ad quos potiſſimum operis utilitas ſit reditura?*

IV. A *Friend* aſks, whether it would not be proper to publiſh the Tranſlation, ſucceſſively, by itſelf; and the Critical Remarks afterwards, by themſelves?—Perhaps it would; but I cannot well alter the terms of my firſt propoſals, without conſulting my ſubſcribers. Two advantages would accrue from that procedure: the whole verſion would be ſooner in the hands of the public, by at leaſt two years; and the author would have an opportunity of making his remarks leſs imperfect from the intermediate obſervations of his critical friends. If therefore this propoſal turn out to be generally agreeable, I ſhall have no objections to comply with it.—See the Appendix.

V. A *Norfolk* Gentleman wiſhes to know, if I be the author of a late *Letter* to the Biſhop of Norwich (now of St. Aſaph's) relative to his Viſitation Sermon?—I ſhould have

hardly

hardly thought it poſſible ſo far to miſtake my ſtyle, as to think that *Letter* written by me; if ſome others, beſide this correſpondent, had not expreſſed their doubt about it.—Be it known then, that I am not the author of that Letter, nor do I know who its author is.—And I take this occaſion to requeſt the public, to give me henceforth no credit for any letter or writing whatſoever, to which my name is not prefixed or affixed.

VI. A *Unitarian* aſks, what I think of the much-diſputed paſſage, 1 John, v. 7?—and very obligingly adds, that he has ſo great an idea of my candour and integrity, that to him my opinion will be equal to a deciſion.—Come then, let the matter be decided.—I think the paſſage in queſtion a manifeſt interpolation, though a very old one—and I refer the queriſt, for his further ſatisfaction, to an excellent, but rather cauſtic, paper in the Gentleman's Magazine, under the ſignature *Cantabrigienſis* *.—Indeed, it is of very little importance whether the ſaid text be genuine or not; but in as far as truth is concerned. For how, independently of other paſſages, it can make *for* or *againſt* a *trinity* of perſons (in the ſenſe of the ſchoolmen) I am not able to conceive.

VII. A Fair Correſpondent ſends this query: "Is your Verſion to be accompanied with prints?"—No, my good lady; not even with a ſingle frontiſpiece! This muſt be left to ſome future Macklin, if future Macklins ariſe,—or rather if my labours merit their attention.—If my book cannot have the fortune to be embelliſhed with prints of the firſt rate, it ſhall not be diſgraced by paltry ones.—There was a time, when the zeal of the *Catholic* Artiſts in London would have been rouſed on ſuch an occaſion; and would not have permitted *Mother Church* to be outrivalled by her *ambitious younger ſiſter*: but thoſe times, and that zeal, I fear, are over—and *Mother Church* may even ſhift for herſelf the beſt ſhe can.

VIII. Mother Church brings to my mind another double query, which was ſent to me ſome time ago, conceived in the following *polite* terms: "Sir, are you a Roman "Catholic? Sir, are you a Chriſtian†?"

To the latter of theſe queries, I anſwer poſitively and peremptorily: "I am a "CHRISTIAN."—In order to give a juſt and *cautious* anſwer to the former, I muſt conſult my old friend and countryman Duns Scotus. Now Duns Scotus inſtructs me (very pro-

* This gentleman will be pleaſed, I think, to know, that his moſt favourable conjecture about F. Simon is probably the true one. That father might have had before him an edition of Hentennius, in which the diacritic *comma* is placed after *in cælo*. Such an edition I have (and a beautiful one it is) of 1567.—But that this is a typographical error, is plain from all the prior and poſterior editions, at leaſt that I have ſeen.

† Theſe curious queſtions were made to me, in conſequence of my having allowed Dr. *Prieſtley* to be a *Chriſtian!* Thus, when Grotius acknowledged, that the *Pope* was not the *Antichriſt*, a zealot wrote a book againſt him, entitled, *Grotius Paganizans!*

perly)

perly) to make a diſtinction between the two terms; and to ſay: "A CATHOLIC I am *abſolutè*, a *Roman* Catholic only *ſecundum quid*." If the queriſt underſtand Latin and Logic, he will be at no loſs to comprehend my anſwer; but in caſe he ſhould be a mere Engliſh ſcholar, and for the ſake of other Engliſh readers (if there be any) who may entertain any doubts about my *catholicity*, I will make my diſtinction as clear and explicit as he or they can wiſh.—If by the epithet *Roman* be only meant, holding communion with the ſee of Rome, and acknowledging the primacy of its Biſhop, I am certainly ſo far a *Roman* Catholic: but in any other ſenſe or reſpect, I am no more a *Roman*, than I am a *French*, *German*, or *Spaniſh* Catholic. If to the appellation *Catholic* any diſcriminating adjunctive were neceſſary, I would call myſelf a *Britiſh* Catholic; but I rather adhere to the ſimple declaration of an ancient martyr: "CHRISTIAN is my name, and "CATHOLIC my ſurname."

COUNSILS.

Of the various and jarring counſils I have received, I will only mention four.

I. A Gentleman, whom I much reſpect, would have me to extend my plan, and to give, along with my New Verſion, a correct copy of the Hebrew text and its principal varieties.—He does not, I fear, conſider to what an immenſe ſize this would ſwell the volumes, and how difficult it would be, in this frivolous and diſſipated age, to find ſubſcribers to defray the expences of ſuch a coſtly work. If, as it is, the price be by many deemed enormous *, who for that reaſon wait for a ſmall edition; what would be ſaid, if I had announced eight or nine volumes in folio at three guineas each?

II. Hence

* Nine guineas are certainly a conſiderable ſum to a man of ſmall fortune; eſpecially when paid all at once: but a guinea and a half, year by year, is not ſo formidable: and many London mechanics ſpend more on ſixpenny numbers of the moſt common productions.—But, not to go out of my own line, let me only calculate what is paid for the ſeveral detached portions of ſcripture, that may be denominated, in ſome ſenſe or other, *New Verſions*.

	£.	s.	d.
Dawſon's 11 chapters of Geneſis	0	9	0
Hopkins's Exodus	0	10	6
Green's Poetic parts	0	6	0
—— Pſalms	0	3	0
Weſton's Deborah	0	2	0
Hodgſon's Proverbs	0	7	6
—— Song of Solomon	0	3	6
Lowth's Iſaiah	1	1	0
Blayney's Jeremiah	1	4	0
Newcome's Ezechiel	0	10	6
—— Minor Prophets	0	10	6
Campbell's Goſpels	2	2	0
Willis's Acts	0	10	6
	£. 8	0	0

All

II. Hence, another friend adviſes me as warmly to condenſe yet more than I have done; elſe, he thinks, the volumes muſt ſwell out to an extraordinary bulk, and put me to expences, of which I am not aware.—This, I believe, is too true. I was never a good calculator of coſts; and here, I ſuſpect, I have grievouſly miſcalculated. It would therefore undoubtedly be my intereſt to follow this advice; and to retrench as much as poſſible: but in the firſt edition of a work like mine, the author is under a ſort of neceſſity of juſtifying his tranſlation, where it deviates from the common ones; and that cannot always be done in few words. I will however make it my conſtant endeavour to be as conciſe as poſſible; and I flatter myſelf that much extraneous matter will not be found in my remarks.—After all, I am now ſenſible, that the price is too low, and that when the paper-maker, printer, &c. have received their ſhares, there will remain but a ſmall premium for the author; unleſs the ſale be uncommonly great.

But why (it may be ſaid) was I not contented with an ordinary paper, an ordinary type, a ſmaller form, and a leſs ſplendid arrangement? To this I have one thing to ſay—I wiſhed, even in the mechanical part of my work, to do as much honour to my patron, and juſtice to my encouragers, as was in my power. If this will not ſatisfy, I have no other apology. My ſoul, thank Heaven, is not a mercenary one. I expect not exceſſive profits even from exceſſive exertions. I truſt I ſhall never want *meat*, and *clothes*, and *fire*; to a philoſophic and contented mind, what more is neceſſary?

III. Mr. P— adviſes me to be more alert in my own cauſe, and more attentive to my own intereſts; upbraids me, in a friendly manner, with a ſtoical ſupinity, that argues (he thinks) more of pride than of prudence; and aſſures me that I ſhall never be able to make any way in this world, by ſuch an ill-timed modeſty. A worthy baronet held forth to me nearly the ſame language, eighteen months ago; and I had nothing to anſwer in my own defence, but that I really could not help it.—After all, what would you have me do, gentlemen?—"Do? Why ſolicit the great, dun the rich, print the approbations of "the learned, write paragraphs in the newſpapers—At leaſt, be at more pains to cir-"culate your Propoſals, and let the world know what you are about."

Well, I have endeavoured to let the world know what I am about. For that purpoſe I publiſhed my *Proſpectus*, my *Letter* to the Biſhop of London, my *Propoſals* and *Specimens*—and now I publiſh this *General Anſwer*.

IV. Clericus wiſhes that I had promiſed no Various Readings; and ſtill would adviſe me not to give any; as they may induce the laity to ſuſpect the text of the Bible to be *uncertain*, and therefore unfit to build their faith upon.

All which (excluſive of the Apocrypha) make not one half of the Scripture: whereas my verſion contains the whole Scripture, including the apocrypha, for one guinea more.—Not to mention the great difference between ſuch a checkered collection of pieces of various impreſſions, papers, forms, and ſtyles; and one uniform work of the ſame colour and complexion, at leaſt, however inferior in other reſpects.

The wiſh may be pious, but it is not a liberal one; the counſil may be well intended, but it is not reaſonable. The laity have as good a right to know the true ſtate of the Bible-Text as any clerk of us all; which if we induſtriouſly conceal from them, we act unfairly. The bad conſequences which, in the fancy of Clericus, would ariſe from purſuing an oppoſite conduct, are altogether imaginary. The more the ſtate of the Scriptures is examined into and made known, the more will their authenticity and authority be enhanced, and corroborated; and, conſequently, a rational faith more ſolidly eſtabliſhed on them.—Yet, if faith itſelf could not be preſerved without guile and diſguiſe, I would ſay, it is not worth the pains of preſerving.

This, however, is not the caſe. For what is faith, in the ſenſe we here conſider it, but a perſuaſion, that the Bible contains a divine ſyſtem of religion? Now to this we are led by motives of credibility—totally independent on various readings, and which no various reading can poſſibly invalidate *. And I make no ſcruple to affirm, that the faith of both laity and clergy is in greater danger of being ſhaken and weakened, by the various and contradictory expoſitions of many ſingle paſſages of ſcripture, where there is no variety of reading; than ever it can be by all the various readings that have been or may be diſcovered. There would, indeed, be little danger from either, if interpreters gave their various *meanings*, with the ſame degree of moderation as I exhibit the various *readings*. For, although I uſe my own judgment in diſcriminating them, retaining in the text ſuch as, after mature deliberation, I deem the more probable, and throwing into the margin ſuch as appear to be the leſs probable; yet I never ſay, you muſt believe either theſe or thoſe to be abſolutely and excluſively the genuine readings, under pain of damnation!—So much for queriſts and counſellors: I muſt now pay my reſpects to the critics.

CRITICISMS.

Theſe are of three ſorts. The firſt relates to the correction and arrangement of the Hebrew text; the ſecond to the ſtyle and diction of my verſion; and the third to my notes and obſervations.

I. With reſpect to the correction of the text, a gentleman who calls himſelf *Buxtorf*, is angry with me for departing in any one inſtance from the preſent Maſoretic copy, which he conſiders complete and perfect in all its parts, and ſeriouſly warns me to be on my guard againſt the contagion "of *Houbigantian*, *Kennicottian*, and *Michäelian madneſs*."—I will attend to this warning, when I ſhall be convinced there is danger, and have changed my opinion concerning the integrity of the Hebrew text.

* For this, it is enough, that the Bible contain the hiſtory and progreſs of revealed religion—a connected ſyſtem of doctrines, centering in JESUS CHRIST, whoſe divine miſſion is ſupported by ſuch a train of evidence, as rarely attends an hiſtorical fact.

II. *Bellarmine*,

II. *Bellarmine*, on the other hand, charges me with the "unſufferable preſumption" of following the Hebrew text (Pſ. xvi. 10.) preferably to the Greek and Latin verſions, ſanctioned by two apoſtles; and affirms that, wherever the Hebrew differs from the antient verſions, and eſpecially from the Latin Vulgate, the former is to be corrected by the latter!

The gentleman's name-ſake, the Cardinal, was not entirely of this opinion: but if he had, it would not weigh much with me. My rule is to read and render according to my own knowledge and conviction. I greatly reſpect both the Greek and Latin verſions; but truth I reſpect ſtill more. The readings and renderings adopted by the apoſtles are not always the beſt: nor was this neceſſary for their purpoſe. Their quotations from the Old Teſtament (generally made from the Septuagint) were never meant as ſanctions of that verſion; but barely as appeals to the Jewiſh records in a tranſlation which the Jews then acknowledged to be genuine; and which was in general uſe among the Helleniſts.—The idea of my good friend Dr. Kennicott, that the parallel paſſages of the New Teſtament were ſure *correctoria* of the Hebrew Text, was founded on a ſuppoſition that will not be readily granted: namely, that the tongues and pens of the apoſtles, and writers of the New Teſtament were, as often as they quoted the Old Teſtament, under the immediate and infallible guidance of the Holy Ghoſt.

III. An anonymous correſpondent is ſadly afraid, leſt, in ſpite of my profeſſed candour and impartiality, I be influenced by religious ſyſtem, and "ſacrifice the Hebrew verity at "the ſhrine of the Vulgate;" and of this diſpoſition, he thinks, he has already obſerved ſome ſymptoms.—To ſo vague and general an accuſation, I would only anſwer, "I plead "not guilty!"—if Philalethes (in the Gentleman's Magazine, 1789, p. 790.) had not brought a more ſpecific charge.

He taxes me with partiality, in regard to Tindal's verſion, for having ſaid in my *Proſpectus*, that "it was an idle affectation in Tindal to tranſlate *overſeer*, *elder*, *congregation*, "inſtead of *biſhop*, *prieſt*, *church*."—I certainly ſaid ſo, becauſe I then thought ſo; and I gave my reaſon for ſo thinking, in the words of Coverdale; namely, that there was no greater difference between the terms rejected, and the terms ſubſtituted, than between *four-pence* and *a groat*.

"But (ſays Philalethes) as the Church of Rome underſtood the words *biſhop*, *prieſt*, "*church*, in a more particular and much higher ſenſe than the Proteſtants thought the "originals meant, Tindal was authorized to employ other equivalent terms."—That is, he was authorized to ſuit the terms to his opinions, and not to reconcile his opinions to the terms. Now I am of opinion, that, in the two firſt inſtances at leaſt, he ſhould have done the latter.

For, ſuppoſing that the Romaniſts had gradually annexed to the terms *biſhop* and *prieſt* ſome new acceſſory ideas, would it not have been better to remark this in a note, than to

change them into other terms that were liable to ſtill greater objections? However literally and equivalently the words *overſeer* and *elder* may convey the general meaning of επισκοπος and πρεσβυτερος, they do not, certainly, ſo well expreſs that particular ſuperintendency and ſeniority implied in the words *biſhop* and *prieſt*; which, ſo far from being technical terms, as Philalethes calls them, are the identical Greek words vernaculized, and appropriated by inveterate uſage to ſignify—not every ſort of *overſeers* and *elders*; but the two chief offices in the Chriſtian miniſtry.

Whether theſe were originally the ſame, is not now the point in debate: they have, for 1700 years at leaſt, been ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed to require different appellations; and the only queſtion is, whether they are to be denominated *biſhops* and *prieſts*, or *overſeers* and *elders*. Tindal rejected the former, becauſe he thought they had been miſunderſtood: I would explain and retain them, becauſe I find no proper diſcriminating terms to ſubſtitute in their place. To ſubſtitute *overſeer* and *elder* would introduce a ſtrange confuſion into language and hiſtory. Cornelius, *overſeer* of Rome, and Cyprian, *overſeer* of Carthage, would be a curious deſignation of thoſe two antient martyrs.—And would it not, even at this day, be as ridiculous to call Dr. Porteus the *overſeer* of London, and Dr. Parker the *elder* of St James's, as it would be to call Meſſrs. Clements and Carnley *Biſhops* of St. George's pariſh, and *Alder*-man Wilkes *prieſt* of Farringdon-without?

The particular objection to the word *prieſt*, as not correſponding with the original πρεσβυτερος, is founded on a miſtake. It correſponds, properly, to no other term; and if it have been uſed to expreſs the Hebrew כהן and the Greek ιερευς, it is abuſively, and for want of another more proper Engliſh word.—They are never confounded in the Septuagint, or in the Vulgate. כהן is always rendered ιερευς in the former, and both are uniformly rendered *ſacerdos* * in the latter: whereas the Hebrew word זקן is, in Greek, always rendered πρεσβυτερος, in Latin *preſbyter* or *ſenior*. *Prieſt*, then, is properly and perfectly equivalent to זקן, πρεσβυτερος and *preſbyter*; but only improperly and catachreſtically to כהן, ιερευς and *ſacerdos*.

As to the word *church*, I am inclined to think that Tindal had reaſon to change it, in certain paſſages, to *congregation*, or ſome ſuch term: both becauſe *church*, in its primary acceptation, expreſſes, neither etymologically nor equivalently, the original meaning of εκκλησια; and becauſe, even in its ſecondary and tralatitious acceptation, it often has a meaning widely different from that of the ſcripture εκκλησια. If, therefore, the word *church* be at all to be retained, its different meanings ſhould be carefully defined and pointed out.

Philalethes has not yet done with me. He finds another proof of my *partiality* in theſe words. "It was unfair, and perhaps inſidious, in Tindal, to put *image* for *idol*, *ordinance* for *tradition*, *ſecret* for *myſtery* or ſacrament."—His reaſoning is ſomewhat extraordinary.

* Our Saxon verſions very properly adopted this word, *Sacerd*; and ſo did the Iriſh, *Sagard*. It has alſo been retained by moſt other European nations. But our next neighbours the French having, improperly, uſed the word *preſtre* in this ſignification, we borrowed it from them, without attending to its etymon.

He

He does not pretend to ſay that *ordinance* is a better tranſlation of παραδοσις than *tradition*, *image* a better tranſlation of ειδωλον than *idol*, or *ſecret* a better tranſlation of μυστηριον than *myſtery*; yet ſtill he maintains that Tindal had a right to prefer the former, and that there was neither unfairneſs nor inſidiouſneſs in ſo doing.—Now, I thought, and ſtill think, that he had no right to prefer them; and that his preferring them, in ſome caſes, argues unfairneſs, and *perhaps* inſidiouſneſs.

For if he deemed them the beſt terms he could uſe, why did he not uſe them uniformly; and why are they chiefly uſed in controverted paſſages? Why, for inſtance, in Matt. xv. 3. doth he render δια την παραδοσιν ὑμων *through your traditions*; and 2 Theſſ. ii. 15. κρατειτε τας παραδοσεις *keep the ordinances*; but becauſe the latter paſſage ſeemed to make for *tradition*, the other againſt it? Is not the tranſlator then, here, evidently loſt in the controverſialiſt?

This is ſtill more apparent from his manner of rendering the word ειδωλον. He knew that *idol* was the correſponding Engliſh word, and uſed it when he choſe (ſee Acts xxi. 25. 1 Cor. viii. 1. x. 4.): but being determined to find idolatry in the Romiſh uſe, or abuſe of images, he would rather pervert the nature of words, than want a ſcripture-text for his purpoſe. Hence Rom. ii. 22. *thou abhorreſt images*; βδελυσσομενος τα ειδωλα—2 Cor. vi. 16. *How agreeth the temple of God with images?* τις δε συγκαταθεσις ναῳ θεου μετα ειδωλων.—Theſe were explicit againſt popiſh images.—But, ſometimes, Tindal's zeal in this matter carried him too far, and made him tranſlate not only unfairly, but ridiculouſly: As Eph. v. 5. *or covetous perſon, which is the worſhipper of images*: η πλεονεκτης, ὁς ἐστιν ειδωλολατρης *.—I wonder much that 1 Pet. iv. 3. eſcaped him; and that he did not render αθεμιτοις ειδωλολατρειαις *abominable image-worſhip*; and not, as he did, *abominable idolatry*.—Our laſt tranſlators having ſometimes followed Tindal, in the rendering of παραδοσις and ειδωλον, is no proof that Tindal had rendered them fairly, but rather a preſumption, that they were not, themſelves, altogether devoid of partiality.

But even when our tranſlators abandon him, Philalethes thinks him juſtifiable; as in reſpect of the word μυστηριον, which "they rendered, (ſays he) I cannot ſay that they tranſlated, *myſtery*: for it is the Greek word with an Engliſh termination."—And pray, is not *ſecret* as much a Latin word with an Engliſh termination? If either of the two, then, was to be vernaculized, the former was clearly the more eligible.

But Philalethes deſires me "to be ſo kind as to ſay, if *ſecret* be not the literal meaning "of the original in Greek authors; and do not convey the true ſenſe of it in the N. "Teſtament?"—To both queries I anſwer negatively. For, 1ſt, neither the Engliſh word *ſecret*, nor the Latin word *ſecretum*, expreſſes the whole literal meaning of μυστηριον. The Latins themſelves were ſo ſenſible of this, that they adopted the Greek word, and

* He did not attend to the difference between the literal and metaphorical ſenſe of ειδωλον.—Though what one *covets*, may be called his *idol*, it cannot with any propriety be called his *image*.

never

never uſed it, I think, in a literal ſenſe, but relatively to religion; any more than did the Greeks.—In ſhort, though every *myſtery* was in ſome ſort a *ſecret*, every *ſecret* was not a myſtery. They are not therefore interconvertible terms.

2dly. Nor does *ſecret*, in my opinion, ever convey the whole ſenſe of μυστηριον, in the New Teſtament: and, ſometimes, it ſeems hardly to convey any part of it. For example, in the very paſſage alluded to in my *Proſpectus*. Eph. v. 32. το μυστηριον τουτο μεγαν ιστιν· εγω δε λεγω, εις Χριστον και εις την εκκλησιαν: which Tindal renders, *This is a great ſecret, but I ſpeak between Chriſt and the congregation.*—Now it happens, that there is here no *ſecret* in the matter. The apoſtle reveals nothing, diſcloſes nothing, but only ſays that the natural union of huſband and wife repreſents the ſpiritual union of Chriſt and his church. And this he calls *a great myſtery*.

Let us now ſubſtitute *ſecret* for *myſtery*, in ſome other paſſages, and ſee how they will ſound. *The ſecret of the ſeven ſtars, &c.* Rev. i. 20.—*I will tell thee the ſecret of the woman and of the beaſt*, &c. Rev. xviii. 7.—And upon her forehead was written a name: SECRET, BABYLON THE GREAT, &c. Rev. xvii. 5.

On the whole I will venture to ſay, that whatever be the original root of the Greek word μυστηριον (which is difficult to determine), it is not equivalently rendered by the word *ſecret*: and that though, in ſome paſſages of holy writ, the latter word may be uſed without much hurting the meaning, it cannot always *. Therefore, I would retain every where the word *myſtery*; and, if need were, explain its reſpective meanings.—I have dwelt the longer on this article, becauſe of all the imputations that can be caſt on me, I wiſh the leaſt to merit that of *partiality*.—And I declare, that if I thought there were a ſingle line or word in my verſion, due to theologic ſyſtem, I would moſt eagerly eraſe it with my own hand.—And, indeed, the ſmalleſt complaint of this kind has not been made, as far as I know. A foreign journaliſt has even ſaid, that I have carried my *liberality* (as he calls it) almoſt too far †. I therefore return to the other criticiſms that concern the *ſtyle* and *diction* of my verſion.

The former, I am happy to find, is allowed to be *clear, unaffected*, and *not inelegant*: and theſe are the principal qualities, which I wiſh it to poſſeſs. But ſome objections have been made to the *diction*, which I will here candidly lay before the public, and endeavour to obviate.

1. The firſt is a general one; namely, that I have employed words, and ſometimes phraſes, that are not ſo familiar to the ears of the vulgar, as thoſe of the public verſion; and, conſequently, that the bulk of the people will not readily underſtand my tranſlation.

* Tindal himſelf muſt have been of this opinion: for out of about twenty-four times when he had occaſion to tranſlate μυστηριον, he renders it ſeventeen times *myſtery*.

† Eichhorn. Algemeine Bibliothek. 1789.

I allow

I allow the charge, but deny the conſequence. I have ſometimes (though perhaps too ſparingly) adopted a phraſeology ſomewhat different from that of the public verſion: but ſo, likewiſe, did the authors of that verſion with reſpect to their predeceſſors: and ſo muſt every new tranſlator do, if he would not ſee his verſion become obſolete even in his own life-time. He is, I conceive, to attend not only to the preſent ſtate of the language of his country, but alſo to what it is likely to be half a century hence; and, if poſſible, to anticipate the improvements it may receive, during that period. I could prove, by a number of inſtances, that JAMES's tranſlators attended to this circumſtance, and adopted many words and phraſes, which were then as little familiar to the vulgar, as any of thoſe which I have ventured to uſe. And, indeed, it has never happened, I think, that even the vulgar miſunderſtood a paſſage from the mere adoption of new terms, or the new arrangement of old ones. From the whole context together they collect the general meaning of a ſentence, and not from any preciſe idea of the radical ſignification of the words that compoſe it. Of ſuch an analyſis they are not capable.—I deny, therefore, that my tranſlation will not be underſtood by the vulgar: nay, I flatter myſelf that it will be more intelligible to the meaneſt capacity, than any Engliſh verſion that yet exiſts.

But it is further urged, that this innovation in phraſeology deſtroys the ſimplicity of the original.—I wiſh this term *ſimplicity* have not, in the minds and mouths of certain critics, a meaning which they can hardly define.—Simplicity in writing, like ſimplicity in dreſs, conſiſts, I think, in chooſing the moſt ſuitable ornaments, and adjuſting them in the moſt natural manner. It may abſolutely ſubſiſt without elegance; but with elegance it is not incompatible, and ſhould never be confounded with ſlovenly careleſſneſs.

Let us now ſuppoſe (which, however, is not true) that ſimplicity, and even elegant ſimplicity, is univerſally predominant in the Hebrew Scriptures: and then the queſtion will be, what ſort of phraſeology is the moſt proper to tranſfer that ſimplicity into a verſion? Now, it is my opinion, that this can be done only by a liberal, but ſtrict, *equipollency*; and not by a ſervile *imitation*. Modes of phraſing, which may have been deemed extremely ſimple in Hebrew, may in Engliſh appear to be highly bombaſtic; and *vice verſa*.—An example or two will ſerve to illuſtrate this propoſition.

The Hebrew hiſtorian could ſay (Gen. xxix. 1.) *Jacob lifted up his feet, and went into the land of the ſons of the Eaſt*. But if I were to ſay to a friend, who had reſolved on viſiting Scotland: "Sir, when do you intend to lift up your feet, and go into the land "of the ſons of the North?" he would certainly think me an idle pedant, and call my language *fuſtian*.—When our tranſlators, therefore, turned either the whole or a part of this Hebraiſm into equipollent Engliſh, they did not deſtroy the *ſimplicity* of the original; but only rejected an idiotiſm, which in Engliſh would have appeared to be quite the reverſe of ſimplicity.

On the other hand, let us invert the order, and ſuppoſe our verſion to be the original.

In it we read (Levit. x. 3.) *And Aaron held his peace:* which, for aught I know, might by the tranſlator be conſidered as a very ſimple mode of expreſſion: but if a Jew, having to turn this Angliciſm into Hebrew, were to render it וידחק אהרן בשלמו, he would literally transfer the Engliſh idiom (though contrary to the genius of his own language), but would evidently loſe the Engliſh ſimplicity: whereas if he uſed the words, which are actually in the Hebrew Text, ויחם אהרן, *And Aaron was ſilent*; he would not only tranſlate equivalently, but more ſimply even than his ſuppoſed original.

The word שלם *peace*, in the laſt example, brings to my mind a crowd of ſimilar inſtances: but what I have already ſaid is ſufficient, I truſt, to convince every intelligent and unprejudiced reader, that ſimplicity in tranſlating conſiſts in equipollency, not in imitation; and that elegant ſimplicity is obtained by ſelecting not the moſt ordinary terms and phraſes, but the beſt and moſt appoſite terms and phraſes that the language affords.

This I take to be very different from that exceſs of refinement, which I have reluctantly cenſured in Caſtalio; and which is, I think, more or leſs chargeable on Dathe *. —As the verſion of this latter is yet but little known in England, and that of Caſtalio almoſt forgotten, it may not be unpleaſing to the curious reader, to ſee here a ſhort ſpecimen of both, contraſted with my own tranſlation. By this, I apprehend, the difference, which I have above remarked between *ſhewy* and *ſimple* elegance, will *(bonâ veniâ dixerim)* be ſtrikingly apparent.—The ſpecimen ſhall be Judah's ſpeech to Joſeph; the moſt perfect model, perhaps, of this ſort of eloquence, that can be produced.

GENESIS XLIV.

CASTALIO.	*DATHE.*	*GEDDES.*
V. 18. Tum Judas accedit, et apud eum hujuſmodi orationem habuit. " Peto " a te, domine, ut mihi " apud te, alterum Pharaonem, pauca dicere liceat " cum bona venia.	18. Tum vero ad eum accedit Juda, atque hunc in modum verba fecit: " Liceat " mihi, domine, pauca apud " te dicere, noli mihi ſuccenſere, te ut Pharaonem venerant.	18. But Judah, coming nearer to him, ſaid: " Oh! " my lord! Let thy ſervant, " I pray thee, ſpeak a word " in my lord's ears; and let " not thine anger burn a- " gainſt thy ſervant: for " thou art, even as Pharaoh!
19. " Cum tu ex nobis " quæſiviſſes, eſſetne nobis " pater aut frater?	19. " Quærebas ex nobis, " domine, num eſſet nobis " pater aut frater?	19. " My lord aſked his " ſervants, ſaying: Have ye " a father, or a brother?

* Profeſſor of Hebrew in the Univerſity of Leipſic; whoſe new and elegant Latin Verſion of the Old Teſtament is juſt finiſhed in 5 volumes 8vo.

20. " Reſpon-

CASTALIO.

20. " Reſpondimus tibi, " domine, patrem eſſe jam " ſenem, et juvenem pue- " rum in ejus ſenecta na- " tum: qui (mortuo ejus " fratre) ſolus ex matre ſu- " pereſſet; quemque pater " amaret.

21. " Tum tu nobis juſ- " ſiſti, ut eum ad te addu- " ceremus, ut eum tuis ipſe " oculis cerneres.

22. " Nos reſpondimus, " patrem ab eo deſeri non " poſſe, quin moreretur.

23. " At tu nos in tuum " conſpectum redire vetu- " iſti, niſi minimus natu fra- " ter nobiſcum deſcendiſſet.

24. " Nos ubi ad patrem " ſervum tuum pervenimus, " tua illi verba, domine, re- " tulimus.

25. " Cumque juberet " nos ad comparandum ali- " quantum commeatus re- " verti,

26. " Reſpondimus, non " licere, niſi fratre noſtro " minimo comitante: aliter " enim in tuum conſpectum " admitti non licere.

27. " At pater noſter, ſer- " vus tuus, dicere; cum ex " duobus filiis, quos ex una " conjuge ſuſtuliſſet,

28. " Alterum (ut nos " ſciebamus) ab ſe digreſ- " ſum, a feris devoratum de- " ploraſſet; nec eum un- " quam poſtea vidiſſet.

29. " Si nos etiam illum " ab ſe abduceremus, et ei " aliquid humanitus acci-

DATHE.

20. " Reſpondebamus, eſſe " nobis patrem ſenem, et ju- " venem puerum in ejus ſe- " nectute natum, qui, fratre " mortuo, ſolus poſt mortem " matris ſuperſtes ſit, patri " perquam carus.

21. " Jubebas ut eum ad te " deduceremus, quod eum " videre velles.

22. " Nos quidem negaba- " mus puerum deſerere poſſe " patrem, quin hic præ mœ- " rore moreretur.

23. " Sed tu affirmabas, " nos ad te admiſſum non iri, " niſi fratrem noſtrum natu " minimum nobiſcum addu- " ceremus.

24. " Nos igitur retulimus " ad patrem noſtrum tuam " voluntatem.

25. " Et cum ille iterum " nos ad cibaria emenda pro- " ficiſci juberet,

26. " Negavimus nos pro- " fecturos, niſi frater noſter " natu minimus nobiſcum eſ- " ſet: quod aliter ſpes non " eſſet, ut ad te admittere- " mur."

27. " Ad hæc reſpondit " pater noſter: noſtis ex duo- " bus filiis mihi ex uxore " mea natis,

28. " Alterum, cum a me " diſceſſiſſet, a feris eſſe de- " cerptum; equidem eum non " amplius vidi.

29. " Jam ſi hunc alterum " quoque a me abduceretis, " atque adverſi aliquid ei

GEDDES.

20. " And we ſaid to my " lord: 'We have an aged " father, and a younger *bro- " ther*, the child of age; " whoſe brother is dead, and " himſelf is the only remain- " ing of his mother; and his " father loveth him.'

21. " And thou ſaidſt to " thy ſervants: 'Bring him " down to me, that I may " ſet mine eyes upon him.'

22. " And we ſaid to my " lord: 'The lad cannot " leave his father; for his " father, were he to leave " him, would die.'

23. " But thou ſaidſt to " thy ſervants: 'Unleſs " your youngeſt brother " come down with you, ye " ſhall no more ſee my face.

24. " Now when we went " up to thy ſervant our fa- " ther, we told him the " words of my lord.

25. " And when our fa- " ther ſaid: 'Go again and " buy for us a little food;'

26. " We ſaid: 'We " may not go down. If our " youngeſt brother be with " us, then will we go down: " for we may not ſee the " man's face, unleſs our " youngeſt brother be with " us.'

27. " And thy ſervant our " father ſaid to us: 'Ye " know that my wife bare to " me but two:

28. " One went out from " me; and I ſaid: He is " ſurely torn in pieces; and " I have not ſeen him ſince.

29. " If ye take this one " alſo from me, and if he " meet with an accident on

CASTALIO.	*DATHE.*	*GEDDES.*
" deret, fore ut ſuam cani- " ciem miſere demitteremus " ad inferos.	" eveniret; ego jam adeo " ſenex vitam meam in ſum- " mo mœrore veſtra culpa fi- " nirem.	" the way: my grey hairs " in ſorrow ye will bring " down to the grave.'
30. " Nunc ſi veniam ad " patrem meum ſervum tu- " um, nec puer nobiſcum " adſit, cujus amore de- " vinctum animum habet,	30. " Igitur ſi ad patrem " reverterer ſine hoc puero, " quem ut ſe ipſe amat,	30. " If therefore, when " I come to thy ſervant our " father, the lad be not with " us;
31. " Simul atque non " adeſſe puerum viderit, mo- " rietur: ita nos, tui, in or- " cum deduxerimus mœrore " confectum et ſenem pa- " trem.	31. " Morietur; et ſic nos " cauſa eſſemus mortis patris " noſtri ſenis, qui ſic in acer- " bo luctu vitam finiiſſet.	31 " It will happen that, " when he ſeeth not the lad, " he will die; for his life is " bound up in the lad's life. " Thus ſhall thy ſervants " bring down in ſorrow to " the grave the grey hairs of " thy ſervant our father.
32. " Ego autem patri " vas factus ſum pueri ſiſ- " tendi, ut ſi eum illi non " reduxiſſem, ei ſempeter- " num obſtrictus eſſem.	32. " Præterea, ego ſpo- " pondi patri me velle pue- " rum ad eum reducere; " quod ni feciſſem, per om- " nem vitam me ei obnoxium " futurum.	32. " Now thy ſervant " became ſurety to his fa- " ther, for the lad, ſaying: " If I bring him not back to " thee, then let me be ob- " noxious to my father all " *my* days.
33. " Quare oro te, ut " ego tibi pro puero ſervus " remaneam, ipſe cum fra- " tribus diſcedat.	33. " Igitur permitte, do- " mine, ut ego pro hoc puero " tibi ſerviam; ipſum vero " demitte cum fratribus ſuis.	33. " Now therefore, I " pray thee, let thy ſervant " remain, a ſlave to my lord, " inſtead of the lad; and let " the lad go up with his " brothers.
34. " Neque enim ſuſti- " neo ad patrem ſine eo re- " dire, ne mihi videnda ſit " calamitas, quæ erit patri " perferenda."	34. " Quomodo enim ego " redirem ad patrem ſine pu- " ero? et viderem calamita- " tem, quæ eum expectat?"	34. " For how can I, the " lad being not with me, go " up to my father; leſt I " ſee the evil that muſt " come on my father?"

Here is the proper place to take notice of another general criticiſm, which has been made on a general poſition, laid down by me in my Proſpectus; namely, " that words which " we have fully adopted from other languages, are generally the leaſt productive of am- " biguity, the leaſt liable to receive acceſſary meanings, and the leaſt likely to deviate " into vulgarity: and that, therefore, they are often preferable to original Saxon words."— This, I find, has not been properly underſtood; probably from my having been too conciſe. I beg leave to explain myſelf.

Of words which we have borrowed from other languages there are two ſorts. The one conſiſts of ſuch terms as have long been perfectly incorporated into our native tongue, and which to a mere Engliſh reader have all the external appearance of Engliſh words: and of ſuch, I will venture to ſay, three fifths of our Lexicon are compoſed.

The

The other conſiſts of words which we are daily coining and introducing; but which have not yet obtained a general currency even among men of letters; and are hardly known to the bulk of citizens.—Theſe latter, however proper and expreſſive they may appear, I ſhould be very unwilling to employ in any tranſlation; much more ſo, in a tranſlation of the Bible.

With regard to the former, I would make the following diſtinctions.

1ſt, If there be no equivalent Saxon word in uſage, there is no choice. The foreign word muſt be uſed—and this even in our public verſion (though made nearly 200 years ago) is, four times out of ſeven, the caſe.

2dly, When there are two terms, the one *domeſtic*, the other *exotic*, both equally expreſſive of the ſame idea, and both of equal uſage; although I am at liberty to chooſe according to the immediate exigency, yet I would generally prefer the former; unleſs euphony or ſome other rational cauſe induced me to do otherwiſe.

3dly, But when it happens, as it frequently does, that of two words, equally authoriſed by uſage, the one is more explicit, more diſcriminating, more noble and more harmonious, I would certainly give the preference to that word, whether it were originally *Saxon*, or *French*, or *Latin*, or *Greek*, or any other language between the poles.

Now as it was my opinion, when I wrote my Proſpectus, that *exotic* words, once become common Engliſh, more generally participated of thoſe qualities, than *aboriginal* words; it was a neceſſary conſequence that I ſhould think them generally preferable. Nor have I yet ſeen any good reaſon to depart from my opinion. My opinion muſt, I think, have been that of all our tranſlators, and particularly of James's tranſlators. Let any one compare their verſion with the popular dialect, I ſay not of their own day, but even of the preſent day; and he will find that wherever a popular term came in competition with one of genteel uſage, a mere Saxon term with one fairly ſaxonized, they almoſt always gave the preference to the latter. They did not adopt the phraſeology of the vulgar; but the vulgar became gradually accuſtomed to their phraſeology: or, rather, had already in a great meaſure become ſo, by hearing and reading the former tranſlations.

I paſs now to the objections that have been made to particular words and ſentences. To a part of theſe I have given anſwers in the Gentleman's Magazine; but as ſome of my readers may not be poſſeſſed of that repoſitory, I will here inſert their ſubſtance along with the others.

1°. Gen. i. 2. I tranſlated *light*, but v. 14. *luminary*, becauſe the Hebrew words אור and מאור, in thoſe two places, are as different as *cauſe* and *effect*.

2°. V. 4. 9. 22. The words *ſever*, *below*, *prolific* I preferred to *divide*, *beneath*, *fruitful*, for the ſake of propriety and diſcrimination.—To *divide*, in its proper and primitive meaning, ſignifies to *cut* a thing into *two* parts; to *ſever* is a more general term, and more applicable to a metaphorical diviſion. It was uſed by Milton in the ſame ſenſe in which I have uſed it. I confeſs, however, that I have uſed it for want of a better term. *Diſtinguiſh*

would perhaps have been better; but I had no Engliſh authority for uſing it in this acceptation. Michaëlis and Dathe have both well expreſſed the meaning of the original. *Er beſtimmete darauf dem lichte und der finſterniſs ihre granzen—Luci et tenebris certos terminos fixit—Set a boundary between light and darkneſs:* but as I had reſtrained myſelf to a more rigid mode of tranſlating, I was obliged to ſelect the beſt ſingle word I could find; and *ſever* appeared to me to be that word*.—I had no heſitation in preferring "below the "heavens" to "under the heavens." The former is the oppoſite to *above*, the latter to *upon*.—As to *prolific*, I have finally rejected it; not becauſe it is not here the more proper term; but for other reaſons that have ſince occurred to me.

4°. I have alſo, v. 24. changed *terreſtrial animals* into *wild beaſts*; as I ſuſpect חית הארץ to be here in contraſt with בהמה *cattle* or DOMESTIC ANIMALS.

5°. The objections that have been made to the word *reptile*, ſeem to be ill-founded. I have obviated them in the notes and remarks.

6°. Gen. ii. 2. מכל מלאכתו אשר עשה I had rendered, *from all his creative operations*. This I think has been juſtly objected to; and I have, accordingly, changed it.

7°. Ib. v. 3. I had rendered אשר ברא אלהים לעשות *which he* (God) *had created into exiſtence:* not, ſurely, to favour an hypotheſis; but partly, becauſe I then thought that might be the true meaning; and partly, becauſe I could find no better verſion. I have ſince found a better in one of our old tranſlations, and have adopted it.

8°. Exod. xiii. 12. *Ye ſhall* MAKE OVER *to the Lord*, &c. has been called "a vulgar "undignified expreſſion:" for what reaſon I am at a loſs to conceive. Had I employed the word *transfer*, I ſhould, moſt probably, have been blamed for refining too much: yet that is the only other term in Engliſh, which conveys the ſtrict meaning of the original word והעברית. To *make over* I gave the preference, becauſe it not only expreſſes the meaning of the original, but is in reality the Hebrew word itſelf, and in the ſame ſort of inflection†.

9°. Exod. xiv. 5. The word *eloped* has been objected to as *trite*, *inelegant*, and even *ludicrous*; "as being applied only to a wife who leaves her huſband, or a ſervant who runs away from his maſter."—I knew all this, and foreſaw that minute criticiſm would lay its fangs on the term. I ventured to employ it, however, on the plea of expediency, becauſe I could find no equivalent, ſo expreſſive of the ſituation of the Iſraelites; who were *eloping* in the ſtricteſt ſenſe of the word: they were ſlaves running away from an imperious and unjuſt maſter; who fancied that they had only gone to ſacrifice in the wilderneſs, and were to return at the end of three days.—There is one word which perhaps might be not improperly ſubſtituted—*had gone off*, or *were going off*: but

* I have ſince ventured to change it into *diſtinguiſh*; which is only giving back to this latter one of its own primary ſignifications.

† That is, in *Hipbil*, or the *cauſtive* voice, *tranſire fecit*.

whether

whether this be more elegant than *eloped*, I leave to the *arbitri elegantiarum* to determine. I will only ſay that the latter is here the moſt explicitly diſcriminating term; and that, to me, it appears to have nothing either in its ſound, its etymology, or ſignification, to degrade it into vulgarity or ludicrouſneſs: unleſs a term become vulgar, by being reſtricted; or the running away of a wife, or ſervant, be a ludicrous thing.

10°. Ib. v. 7. *Tribunes* has been juſtly objected to: and I have changed it.

11°. Ib. v. 8. I have here, it is ſaid, admitted "a ſhocking vulgarity of expreſſion;" by rendering יצאים ביד רמה *were now manifeſtly going off*.—Well, critics are certainly clear-ſighted mortals. I had almoſt applauded myſelf on being able to expreſs the ſenſe (or at leaſt what I take to be the ſenſe) of the original in clear equivalent terms. The Hebrew יד רמה is preciſely the Latin *manus-feſta*; although the latter part of the compound is no more uſed in Latin. I thought it therefore a lucky circumſtance, that we had adopted this word, and could not but conſider it as more proper than *evidently* or *openly*. Nor can I ſee any thing vulgar, much leſs "ſhockingly vulgar," in the expreſſion.—Whether I have miſtaken the meaning, is another queſtion, that deſerves, perhaps, to be reconſidered.

12°. Ib. v. 5. I have uſed *embarraſſed* for *entangled*. The latter is, I think, the better term.

13°. Exod. xv. 1. *Canticle* has been objected to; and perhaps with ſome juſtice. My reaſon for preferring it to *ſong* was, that *ſong* has now a very different acceptation: and I believe, that if *canticle* had been adopted by our laſt tranſlators, I ſhould be charged with vulgarity for ſubſtituting *ſong*.—So true it is that moſt men are diſpoſed to make that verſion the ſtandard of taſte—with or without reaſon. We ſhall ſee a flagrant inſtance of this hereafter.

14°. Ib. v. 3. The Italic *peculiar* has been remarked to be ſuperfluous: and indeed it is ſo.

15°. Ib. v. 12. I have been blamed for tranſpoſing (with Green) this verſe to the end of verſe 10.—I have been blamed, I think, without reaſon.

16°. Ib. v. 26. I have received no leſs than three remonſtrances againſt the word *phyſician*: and yet I cannot help thinking that it is here the moſt proper rendering of רפא.—It will not, I think, be denied, that רפא means a *phyſician*. Our tranſlators have ſo rendered it four or five times*. But if it ever be a proper rendering of רפא it is in this paſſage. To heal implies a previous ſore, or ſomething to be healed. But here God declares that there ſhall be nothing to heal; and that his people, if they obſerve his commandments, ſhall ſuffer none of thoſe diſeaſes which he had inflicted on the Egyptians. For he himſelf will care for their health—i. e. be their *phyſician*. But "*phyſician* ſeems, when ap-" plied to God, a degrading term."—Is healer leſs ſo? or twenty other terms applied to

* See Gen. 50. 2. 2 Chron. 16. 12. Job. 13. 4. Jer. 8. 22.

him

him in the Scriptures? This is truly to cavil, not to criticiſe. I mean, ſo to me it appears.

17°. A very angry correſpondent indeed, who calls himſelf a *Proteſtant Preſbyter*, thinks it impoſſible that our tranſlators could ſo far miſtake the meaning of Pſ. xvi. 3. as to make *excellent ſaints* of *profane divinities!* And challenges me to produce my reaſons for tranſlating as I have done. If the gentleman had made this demand in more civil terms, perhaps I might have indulged him. As it is, I will content myſelf with telling him, that the Original cannot, without violence, admit of any other meaning; and that every other meaning makes the Pſalmiſt ſpeak—what I will not name. If he be not pleaſed with this anſwer, he muſt patiently wait for my *Critical Remarks.*

18°. My having, in the ſame Pſalm, v. 9. tranſlated ויצל כבדי *and my* LIVER *rejoiceth*, has expoſed me to a number of critical ſquibs from different quarters; and even from *babes and ſucklings* in criticiſm. In a certain northern diſtrict, I am told it has raiſed a greater uproar than Jerome's *ciceion** once did in Africa.

"My liver rejoiceth!" exclaims one: "Who ever heard of a *Liver* rejoicing?" Dr. "G. ſays another, might have as well ſaid, *my lungs rejoice*—or *my guts rejoice*—or "*my kidneys rejoice*; as *my liver rejoiceth!*"—And ſo perhaps he would, gentlemen, if he had found *kidneys*, *lungs*, or even *guts* (bowels) in his original. But to be ſerious, it is evident that לב and כבד are here parallel terms. We muſt therefore render them both literally, or both metaphorically; elſe the paralleliſm will diſappear. Now it appears to me, that a literal rendering here beſt preſerves the force and beauty of the paralleliſm; than which, perhaps, a more natural one can hardly be conceived. The *Heart* and the *Liver* are two conſpicuous correſponding parts, the one placed in the right, the other in the left ſide of the human body. How far the latter is really affected by *joy* or *grief*, I muſt leave to phyſiologiſts and anatomiſts to determine. It is enough for me, that in the eſtimation of the Hebrew writer it was deemed ſo. Nor was this idea peculiar to the Hebrews. We find the ſame notion entertained, and the ſame, or ſimilar expreſſions uſed by the moſt elegant Greek and Roman poets†.

If לב then had a juſt claim to be here tranſlated *heart*, כבד had an equal claim to be tranſlated *liver*.—Indeed I know not how elſe I could have rendered it. In a metaphorical ſenſe, כבד or כבוד ſignifies *glory*: but what parallelility is there between *glory* and *heart?* Beſides, *my glory rejoiceth*, is as abſurd as my *joy rejoiceth*. The Septuagint tranſlated γλωσσα *tongue*: but ſurely the *tongue* is a leſs correſponding parallel term than *liver*: and, moreover, cannot in any ſenſe be called the ſeat of joy; although it may be called the

* In Hebrew קיקיון, which in our public verſion is rendered *gourd*; but which in reality is a plant of the *ricinus* kind; called in Egypt *kiki*.

† See Anac. Od. 3. Horace, B. 1. Ode 13.

organ

organ of rejoicing.—On the whole, I found I had no choice left me, but either to tranſlate literally the Hebrew word for the ſake of the paralleliſm, or ſubſtitute a metaphor, at the riſk of deſtroying the paralleliſm: even then I had but one choice, and that is *ſoul*.—Yet ſure I am that, if it had pleaſed our laſt tranſlators to render כבד *liver*, I ſhould be charged with temerity, wantonneſs of innovation, and perhaps unfaithfulneſs, if I had ſubſtituted either *tongue*, or *glory*, or even *ſoul*.

19°. I have been rebuked, rather ſeverely, by a *Philochriſtos*, for rendering (ibid. v. 10) חסידיך *thy* PIOUS *one*, inſtead of *thy Holy one*: "ſeeing," ſays he, "that the word relates to "*Jeſus Chriſt*, who is the HOLY ONE of God: and to whom the word PIOUS does not "ſo well agree."—Which of the two terms agrees beſt with CHRIST I hardly know: but this I know, that חסיד in the Hebrew Scriptures is never confounded with קדש; and that the proper rendering of the former is *pious*, of the latter *holy*.

20°. I have already obſerved that I had been taxed with raſhneſs and preſumption, for departing from the tranſlation of the Greek and Vulgate (which here are indeed but one) in rendering this whole verſe. A warm *Theologian* goes farther, and affirms it is little leſs than *hereſy*. It is well he did not make it hereſy *complete*. With ſuch arrant theologians as theſe, there is no reaſoning the matter: but perhaps authority may have ſome weight with them. Arias Montanus has been always deemed a good catholic and an orthodox divine. Hear then how he renders: *Quoniam non relinques animam meam in ſepulchro; non dabis miſericordem tuum videre foveam.*—Yet I confeſs that I am not quite ſatisfied either with Arias's verſion, or with my own.—*Dî meliora, forſitan!*

IV. My *Notes* and *Critical Remarks* have alſo been cenſured, not for the *ſtyle*, but for the *doctrines* contained in them.—Theſe cenſures are alſo of two ſorts, general and particular.

The former have been more copiouſly beſtowed upon me, becauſe they are more eaſily made. The tenor and ſum of them is—That I am too bold a critic; that I pay too little regard to authority; that I deal too freely with the Fathers; that I adopt erroneous or ſuſpicious opinions; that I advance paradoxes; that I defend what ought not to be defended, diſapprove of what I am bound to approve, praiſe where I ſhould cenſure, and condemn where I ſhould praiſe—In a word, that I am a much better *Linguiſt*, *Grammarian* and *Philologiſt*, than a *Logician*, *Metaphyſician*, or *Divine**. I am glad they allow me to be a *Divine* at all: and will, for this conceſſion, make, in return, a very conſiderable acknowledgment. If by *Divinity* they mean that wretched ſyſtem of ſcholaſtic dogmatiſm, which is even at this day taught in our univerſities, I frankly confeſs that I have for theſe twenty years paſt been trying to unlearn as much as I could

* I deem it no ſmall glory to be treated like the great *Eraſmus*.

of

of it: and in this reſpect, I will readily allow that I am far from being a *great Divine*: but if true theological knowledge conſiſt in a long and thorough acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures, with Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, the writings of the Antients, and the whole chain of Univerſal Tradition—I flatter myſelf that I am no deſpicable *Theologian*.

As to what is called *metaphyſics*, I am ready to own that I am an infant in that ſcience, and almoſt totally unacquainted with its myſteries. Not that I never attempted to unveil them. I often eſſayed, but eſſayed in vain. Even Clarke's famous argument, for the *Exiſtence of God*, I could never underſtand, and, at this day, think it only an ingenious ſophiſm. If I were to give a definition of this *tranſcendantly* noble ſcience, I would call it the art of puzzling, or a ſcience that teacheth how to confound REASON. Indeed when I find one great metaphyſician *proving* that there exiſts no *matter*, another great metaphyſician *proving* that there exiſts no *ſpirit*: and thus, between them, reducing the whole univerſe to a miſerable void (not to mention a thouſand other metaphyſical extravagances which this century has hatched), I am tempted to inſert in my Litany the following petition—*A metaphyſicis libera me, Domine!*

The character of *Logician* I will not give up ſo tamely. I know all the moods and figures of Ariſtotle! I have read Des Cartes, Locke and Malebranche! And what I value more than all that, God of his goodneſs has endowed me with a ſhare of *common ſenſe*: and it is my firm belief, that a greater or leſs portion of this uſeful commodity makes a man a better or worſe *Logician*.

Beſide theſe vague and general imputations, two or three particular charges of *Heterodoxy*, forſooth, have been brought againſt me.

1°. The firſt is, "That I have inſinuated a belief in the eternity of matter!"—But this is a groſs miſtake, or a grievous miſrepreſentation. No where have I inſinuated ſuch a belief; although I have fairly given it as my opinion that matter may have exiſted, and probably did exiſt, before the period of the ſix days creation: and this opinion I conceive to be not only not contrary to Scripture, but clearly deducible from it. I quoted Origen, as having been of this opinion, or rather as giving it for the current *Catholic* opinion of his day; and I added that even his great adverſary St. Jerome did not, in the main, much differ from him. An anonymous obliging correſpondent affirms, indeed, that I have miſunderſtood St. Jerome: and that is poſſible. Let the reader judge. His words are theſe: "Sex millia necdum noſtri orbis implentur anni: et quantas prius æternitates, quanta "*tempora*, quantas *ſæculorum* origines fuiſſe arbitrandum eſt; in quibus angeli, throni, "dominationes cæteræque virtutes ſervierint Deo, et abſque temporum vicibus atque "menſuris, Deo jubente, ſubſtiterint* ?"—Were thoſe angels, thrones and dominations creatures, or did they exiſt from all eternity?—"They were creatures, it will be ſaid; but "not *material* beings."—Be it ſo (although even that cannot be proved): they were *crea-*

* Comment. in Tit. cap. 1. vol. 4. p. 411. Ed. Martianay.

tures

tures however, and conſequently, according to Jerom, the ſix-days creation was not the firſt exertion of creative power.—Whether our Earth was then originally created, or only reſcued from darkneſs and deſolation, is mere matter of opinion; and I was at liberty to adopt that ſide of the queſtion which I judged to be moſt conſiſtent with my Text, and with my reaſon. In expreſſing my ſentiments on this ſubject, I have uſed one or two, perhaps, too ſtrong terms: theſe ſhall be qualified.

2°. Some lynx-eyed *Anglo-Flemiſh* Divines have, I am told, diſcovered *Præadamitiſm* in my Remarks.—I ſhould be much obliged to them if they would be pleaſed to point out the place; but before they undertake that hard taſk, I would adviſe them firſt to read over La Peyrere's Book; that they may not idly fight with a phantom of their own creation, and miſtake windmills for giants.

3°. A brother clergyman, of great piety and much uſeful learning, blames me for giving up too eaſily the argument for a plurality of perſons in the Godhead, drawn from theſe words: "Let us make man, &c."—But my good friend will be pleaſed to obſerve, that I have not at all taken upon me to defend the argument, but have left it in the hands of the moſt eloquent orator of his age. If I have ſaid that there are others of a different opinion, I have only ſaid the truth, and no more than, as an impartial interpreter, I was obliged to ſay.—I might, it is true, have contented myſelf with a bare tranſlation; but I thought the paſſage one of thoſe, where the offices of tranſlator and commentor ſeem to coaleſce; and under that idea I introduced the queſtion.—For the reſt, my friend is certainly wrong in aſſerting that the uſe of the plural for the ſingular, in the firſt perſon, is not an Orientaliſm. If he will but conſult the following places; 2 Sam. 16. 20. 1 Kings 12. 9. Cantic. 1. 4. Dan. 2. 36. Mark 4. 30. John 3. 11. and then ſee what ſtrainings have been made by Glaſſius and others, to reconcile thoſe paſſages with what is called the *Analogy of Faith*, he will be convinced of the contrary.—Even Mahomet himſelf (or whoever was the author of the Koran), though certainly a moſt rigid unitarian, frequently introduces God ſpeaking in the plural number. "We delivered "you—We divided the ſea—We made a covenant with Moſes, &c. &c."—See *Sur.* 2. paſſim.

Thus have I endeavoured, for once, to ſatisfy my *Queriſts*, *Counſillors* and *Cricics*: with what ſucceſs I cannot tell; but I have reſolved to make no more ſimilar efforts, until I have completed my work, which more than ever demands every moment of my time, and every degree of my attention: and it will not, I truſt, be expected that I ſhould allow myſelf to be diverted from it by future *queries*, *counſils*, or *criticiſms*. I ſay not this by way of deprecation; much leſs through a ſupercilious contempt. Far from deſpiſing the critics, I will carefully attend to whatſoever they ſhall ſay; and if I cannot ultimately anſwer their objections, I will acknowledge their force. I am not inſenſible of my own deficiency, though, doubtleſs, I ſee it not all. I am not, I think, elated with an opinion of my ſuperior abilities: yet "without ſome ſtock

"of confidence," as Howell remarks, "no work beneficial to mankind can ever "be begun or carried on."—Animated with a fervid zeal for the progreſs of Literature and for the intereſts of Religion, I have dedicated my talents, ſuch as they are, to the elucidation of that Book, which, with excellent models of every ſort of ſtyle, contains the moſt perfect ſyſtem of religious doctrines. The attempt was ſurely, commendable; materials have not been wanting; the labour has been great—But, ὅτι ὁ φυτεύων ἐστί τι, ὅτι ὁ ποτίζων· ἀλλ' ὁ αὐξάνων ΘΕΟΣ.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX.

I HAVE ſaid, p. 6, that ſeveral of my ſubſcribers have ſolicited me to publiſh the whole *Tranſlation* and *Explanatory Notes* together firſt; and the *Critical Remarks* together afterwards; and I have obſerved that this method would be attended with at leaſt one convenience. But as others, whom I have conſulted, ſeem averſe to this plan, I find it neceſſary to adhere to the original *conditions*, which I here reprint with ſome propoſed alterations, not liable, I truſt, to any kind of objection.

CONDITIONS.

I. The WORK will be compriſed in SIX large volumes in quarto; printed on a fine Super-Royal Paper manufactured for the purpoſe.

II. The FOUR firſt volumes will contain all the Books of the OLD TESTAMENT; the FIFTH thoſe of the NEW, and the SIXTH will conſiſt of a GENERAL PREFACE; with MAPS and INDEXES to the whole.

III. The PRICE of each volume, to SUBSCRIBERS, will be ONE GUINEA AND A HALF; to be paid in the following manner: *One Half Guinea* at the time of ſubſcribing; *a Guinea and a Half* on the delivery of each of the FIVE FIRST volumes; and *One Guinea* on the delivery of the laſt volume.

IV. As ſoon as the number of ſubſcribers ſhall amount to a *Thouſand*, the work will be put to the preſs, and printed with as much expedition as ſo complex a page, and ſuch variety of letter will admit of.

On theſe CONDITIONS I beg leave to make two or three obſervations.

I. With reſpect to the number of volumes, I begin to fear, that the NEW TESTAMENT will, from its great importance, require more than ONE: but in that caſe, the ſubſcribers ſhall be previouſly conſulted, and will be at liberty to take or not to take the additional volume of *Preface*, &c. the other volumes being, in ſome ſort, and for moſt readers, a complete work by themſelves.

II. Although my liſt of ſubſcribers is not yet nearly full; yet, relying on the generoſity of an enlightened PUBLIC, and truſting that my work will, ſooner or later, meet with ITS approbation, I have ventured to ſend it to the preſs before the time ſtipulated in my CONDITIONS. Ten ſheets of the FIRST volume are actually printed, and the reſt ſhall follow with as little interruption as poſſible.

III. Some of my ſubſcribers have expreſſed a deſire to have the work delivered in NUMBERS. But, though intereſt, perhaps, would lead me to that method, there are ſo many rational objections to it, that I cannot bring myſelf to adopt it. However, to gratify the requeſt of ſome particular friends, I am willing to deliver the firſt volume, in three TOMES, or *Livraiſons*, to ſuch ſubſcribers (and to ſubſcribers only) as ſhall chooſe to have it ſo delivered. On this plan, the *firſt* tome will contain the books of *Geneſis* and *Exodus*; and may, poſſibly, be ready for delivery about the meeting of parliament. The *ſecond* tome will contain *Leviticus*, *Numbers*, *Deuteronomy*, and perhaps *Joſhua*; and may be expected about Chriſtmas; and the *Critical Obſervations*, or *third* tome, about next Eaſter.

I ſubjoin a Liſt of ſuch SUBSCRIBERS as have come to my knowledge; and as I ſuſpect that ſome of the names are not accurately written, I wiſh them to be corrected by the perſons themſelves. I have no doubt but there are ſeveral names, both at home and abroad, which have not yet reached me. It would be kind in thoſe who wiſh to encourage this expenſive work, to ſend their commands immediately to the author; who, reſiding conſtantly in the capital, will have the pleaſure of receiving them ſooner by this means, than by any intermediate application.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

His Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales
His Royal Highneſs the Duke of York
His Royal Highneſs the Duke of Glouceſter
His Serene Highneſs the Duke of Wirtemberg
His Serene Highneſs the Prince Biſhop of Bamberg and Würtzburg—2 copies
His Serene Highneſs the Prince of Taxis

Her Royal Highneſs the Dutcheſs of Glouceſter 6 Copies

A.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Amherſt
Admiral Philip Affleck
William Aynge, Eſq.
Rev. Mr. James Archer
Mr. Joſeph Adams
Mr. —— Aikin

B.

Marquis of Buckingham
Earl of Buckinghamſhire
Earl of Beſborough
Thomas Birch, Eſq.
William Birch, Eſq. Bond-ſtreet
Joſeph Birch, Eſq. Eſſex
Joſiah Birch, Eſq. ditto
Alexander Bower, Eſq. Kinnettles
John Brown, Eſq. Liſbon
Iſaac Brown, Eſq. Dunkirk
—— Brown, Eſq. Hackney
Timothy Brown, Eſq. Mary Hill
Charles Butler, Eſq. Lincoln's Inn
——— Burney, Eſq. Barborne
Al. Begbie, Eſq. London
Leonard Bartholomew, Eſq.
The Rev. Dr. Blayney, Oxford
The Rev. Dr. Buchner
The Rev. Mr. William Bradley, Oxford
The Rev. Mr. Kingſman Baſket, Cambridge
The Rev. Mr. John Brewer, Liverpool
The Rev. Mr. Jonathan Boucher
J. and C. Berry, bookſellers, Norwich
P. Byrne, bookſeller, Dublin—2 copies

C.

Sir Grey Cooper, Bart.
Sir David Carnegie, Bart.
Patrick Carnegie, Eſq. Lour
The Rt. Hon. William Burton Cunninghame
Henry Crawthorne, Eſq.
John Chicheſter, Eſq.
George Cuthbert, Eſq.
George Chalmers, Eſq.
Charles Cooper, Eſq. Norwich
The Rev. Dr. Cooper
The Rev. Mr. Crutwel, Oakingham
The Rev. Mr. Clarke
The Rev. Mr. Carpendale, Dublin
The Rev. Mr. J. Carter, Wolverhampton
The Rev. Mr. W. Sam. Carter, Feſtfield
The Rev. Mr. Charles Cordell, Newcaſtle
Dr. J. Clarke, ditto
Mr. Charnley, bookſeller, ditto
Dr. Campbell, Tobago
Mrs. Corner, Maddox-ſtreet
Mr. John Clarke, Enfield
Mr. James Corrie, Hackney

D.

The Right Rev. the Biſhop of Dromore
Robert Douglas, Eſq. Berners-ſtreet
James Duff, Eſq. Saliſbury-ſtreet
Daniel Duff, Eſq. Batterſea
James Durno, Eſq. Memel
William Dickie, Eſq. Bedford-ſquare
The Rev. Dr. Diſney
The Rev. Mr. Dimock

E.

Counteſs of Elgin
Sir James Erſkine, Bart.
Eaton College
Arthur Etherley, Eſq. Southampton
The Rev. Mr. R. M. Edye

F.

Sir William Forbes, of Pitſligo, Bart.
The R. Hon. ——— Fitzherbert
William Fermor, Eſq.
The Rev. Principal Farquharſon
Mr. Stephen Freeman, Honiton
Mr. Francis

G.

The Duke of Grafton
The Duke of Gordon
The Ducheſs of Gordon
John Gordon, of Cairnfield, Eſq.
Col. Charles Gordon, of Sheelagreen, Eſq.

James

James Gordon, of Letterfury, Eſq.
Alexander Gordon, of Cairnbanno, Eſq.
Rev. Principal Gordon
Mr. William Gordon, Edinburgh
P. Galway, Eſq. Norfolk
The Rev. the Dean and Chapter of Glouceſter
The Rev. Dr. Goodinge
The Rev. Dr. Goſſet
The Rev. Dr. Samuel Glaſſe
The Rev. Mr. William Green, Hardington
The Rev. Mr. Griffith
The Rev. Mr. Thomas Giſborne
The Rev. Mr. Graves
The Rev. Mr. John Geddes
Mr. Archibald Geddes, Leith
Mr. John Geddes, Glaſgow

H.

Lady Mary Howard
Philip Howard, Eſq. Corby Caſtle
Henry Howard, Eſq. ditto
Robert Howard, Eſq. Dublin
Count Hadrion, Wurtzburg
Baron Hutton
F. Brand Hollis, Eſq.
John Hollis, Eſq. High Wycomb
Miſs Hume
Peter Hainſworth, Eſq.
B. Thomas Howel, Eſq.
Robert Harvey, Eſq.
The Rev. Dr. Hales
The Rev. Dr. Holmes
The Rev. Mr. Thomas Huſſey
The Rev. Mr. John Hawkins
The Rev. Mr. Howes
The Rev. Mr. John Hobſon
Mr. Thomas Hawes, Old Gravel-lane
Mr. William Herbert, Cheſhunt
Mr. George Humphreys, Birmingham
Mr. Samuel Hayes, ditto
The Rev. Mr. James Hall
Mr. ——— Hincks, Hac. Col.
Mr. Charles Hippuph, Birchin-lane

I.

Joſhua Iremonger, Eſq.

J.

Sir William Jones, Bart.
Sir William Jerningham, Bart.
Edward Jerningham, Eſq.
John Mills Jackſon, Eſq.
Adam Jellicoe, Eſq.
John Johnſon, Eſq.
Mr. W. Jillard, Hac. Col.
Mr. J. Joice, ditto
Mr. Jno. Jones, ditto

K.

The Rt. Rev. the Biſhop of Killala
The Rev. Dr. Kippis
The Rev. Mr. John Kirk
The Rev. Mr. John Kelly
The Rev. Mr. W. B. Kirvan
Mr. William Kinnaird, Holborn

L.

Marquis of Lanſdowne—2 copies
The Rt. Rev. the Biſhop of Landaff
The Rt. Rev. the Biſhop of London
The Rev. Dr. Lickeriſh
The Rev. Mr. Theophilus Lindſay
Dr. Lettſom
Thomas Lamare, Eſq.
The Rev. Mr. George Lewis, London
The Rev. Mr. W. Leſlie, Longbride
The Rev. Mr. James Lambert, Cambridge
John Lowis, Eſq. Ridley-hall
Mrs. Sophia Lea, Bath
Univerſity Library, Oxford
Univerſity Library, Cambridge
Society Library, of Trinity College, Cambridge
Univerſity Library of Edinburgh
Advocates Library of Edinburgh
Univerſity Library of Glaſgow
Liverpool Public Library

Birmingham Public Library
Library of St. James's Monaſtery, Ratiſbon
Library of St. James's Monaſtery, Wurtzburg

M.

The Rt. Rev. the Biſhop of Morocco
The Rev. Sir Charles Mile, Bart.
Sir Francis Molyneaux, Bart.
Sir Herbert Macworth, Bart.
Miſs Juliana Macworth
Miſs Jean Macworth
Major Maire
George Maxwell, of Munches, Eſq.
Mrs. Maxwell, of Terraughty
Mrs. Macdonald, Garva-More
Robert Madan, Eſq. Vere-ſtreet
The Rev. Dr. Madan, Madrid
The Rev. Mr. James Maclean
The Rev. Mr. John Maſon
The Rev. Mr. Morgan, Hac. Col.
Mr. James Mavor, Fox's court
Mr. Sam. Maſkall, Mitre-court
Mr. John Murray, bookſeller

N.

Lord North
Dudley North, Eſq.—2 copies
Richard Neave, Eſq.
John Newton, Eſq.

O.

Sir Francis O'Brien, Bart.
Dennis O'Brien, Eſq.
Mrs. Onſlow
Profeſſor Onymus, Wurtzburg
The Rev. Mr. James Oldnal, Worceſter
Mr. William Obiit, Carnaby Market

P.

Lord Petre—50 copies
Lady Petre
Hon. Robert Petre, Eſq.
Sir William Pepperel, Bart.
Captain William Payne
The Rev. Dr. Price
The Rev. Dr. Prieſtley
The Rev. Mr. Palmer
Thomas Palmer, Eſq.
The Rev. Mr. Robt. Paterſon
Mr. Richard Peyton
Mr. Pelham

R.

Antony John Rucher, Eſq.
Samuel Rein, Eſq.
——— Rotherham, Eſq.
The Rev. Dr. Radcliffe
The Rev. Dr. Rees
The Rev. Dr. Roberts
The Rev. Dr. Thomas Robinſon
The Rev. Mr. Henry Robinſon, Kendal
Dr. Robertſon, Hithe, near Southampton
The Rev. Mr. James Roe
The Rev. Mr. William Reid, Hac. Col.
The Rev. Mr. John Reid
Mr. Arthur Reid, Pimlico
Mr. John Ring, New-ſtreet
Mr. John Ryan, Worceſterſhire
Mr. Roſs, Crown-court
Mr. William Rawlinſon, Friday-ſtreet
Mr. Robſon, bookſeller

S.

The Marchioneſs of Stafford
Earl Spencer
Lord Stourton
The Rt. Rev. the Biſhop of Saliſbury
Sir John Smith, Bart.
Robert Smith, Eſq.
Thomas Stapleton, Eſq.
Hamilton Sackville, Eſq.
Bernard Shaw, Eſq.
Andrew St. John, Eſq.
James Stuart, Eſq.
Alexander Scott, Eſq.
Robert Digby Himbleton Smith, Eſq.

Thomas

Thomas Suffield, Esq.
John Stone, Esq.
The Rev. Mr. Strickland
The Rev. Dr. Smallwood
The Rev. Mr. Salmon, Cambridge
The Rev. Mr. Smelley, jun.
The Rev. Mr. Stock, Hac. Col.
Dr. Symmonds, Cambridge
The Rev. Mr. Surtis,
The Rev. Mr. Southworth
The Rev. Mr. Simpson
The Rev. Mr. Smirnove
Mr. Robert Smith, Birmingham
Mr. Timothy Smith
Mr. J. Stone, Nottingham
Mr. Schalefield, T. Col. Oxon.
Mr. Swaine, Leeds
Mr. Shepherd, Hac. Col.
Mr. Nicholas Storey, N. C.
Mr. Sharp, Engraver
Mr. Thomas Symonds, Fleet-street
Mr. Swale
Mr. Richard Stocker, Titchfield

T.

Earl of Traquaire—2 copies
The Right Rev. Dr. Troy
John Throgmorton, Esq.
Henry Thornton, Esq.
Robert Thornton, Esq.
Isaac Thompson, Esq.
J. Toogood, Esq.
James Taffie, Esq.
The Rev. Mr. Taylor, Ely-place
The Rev. Mr. Peter Taylor, Titchfield
The Rev. Mr. Henry Taylor, Spredlington
Captain Alexander Taylor
Mr. Taylor, Hac. Col.
Mr. Wm. Taylor, Tottenham-court Road
The Rev. Mr. Travill
The Rev. Mr. Trew
The Rev. Mr. Twigge
The Rev. Mr. Tingcomb, Hac. Col.

V.

James Veitch, Esq. Lord Elliock
Col. Charles Vallencey
Nicholas Vansittart, Esq.

W.

The Earl of Wycombe
The Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Waterford
William Wilberforce, Esq.
Major Wilford
Dr. Warren
Mrs. Walker
The Rev. Dr. Joseph Wilks, Bath
The Rev. Mr. Walsby
The Rev. Mr. George Waddington
The Rev. Mr. Wood, Leeds
Mr. Charles Welbeloved, Hac. Col.
Mr. Wilcocks, Norwich

Y.

The Rev. Mr. Yates, Liverpool

13 MA 53